

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON
PORTLAND DIVISION

**IVAN B. LANGLEY and
KARLEE E. LANGLEY,**

Plaintiffs,

v.

No. 11-CV-774-PK

**SHIRLEY E. JONES and
CHARLEE A. PHILLIPS, JR.,**

Defendants.

ORDER

Ivan B. Langley
Karlee E. Langley
29135 Langley Road
Huntington, Oregon 97097
Pro se

Timothy O'Hanlon
Mautz & O'Hanlon
P.O. Box 628
Pendleton, Oregon 97801
Attorney for Defendants

SIMON, District Judge:

On January 10, 2012, Magistrate Judge Paul Papak filed Findings and Recommendations in this case (doc. # 31). Judge Papak recommended that Plaintiffs' claims be dismissed for lack

of subject-matter jurisdiction, and that Plaintiffs be allowed 30 days to amend their complaint, if appropriate. No objections have been filed. [Plaintiffs have not filed an amended complaint.]

Under the Federal Magistrates Act, the court may “accept, reject or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). If a party files objections to a magistrate’s findings and recommendations, “the court shall make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.” *Id.*; Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3).

If, however, no objections are filed, the Magistrates Act does not prescribe any standard of review. In such cases, “[t]here is no indication that Congress, in enacting [the Magistrates Act] intended to require a district judge to review a magistrate’s report[.]” *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 152 (1985); *see also United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (*en banc*) (court must review *de novo* magistrate’s findings and recommendations if objection is made, “but not otherwise”).

Although in the absence of objections no review is required, the Magistrates Act “does not preclude further review by the district judge[] *sua sponte* . . . under a *de novo* or any other standard.” *Thomas*, 474 U.S. at 154. Indeed, the Advisory Committee Notes to Rule 72(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure recommend that “[w]hen no timely objection is filed,” the court review the magistrate’s findings and recommendations for “clear error on the face of the record.”

No objections having been made, the court follows the recommendation of the Advisory Committee and reviews Magistrate Judge Hubel’s findings and recommendations for clear error on the face of the record. No such error is apparent.

Accordingly, I ADOPT Magistrate Judge Papak’s Findings and Recommendation

(docket # 31). Because Plaintiffs have not filed an amended complaint, this case is dismissed with prejudice for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 8th day of March, 2012.

/s/ Michael H. Simon

Michael H. Simon
United States District Judge